



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/802,411	1 03/09/2001		Dominik J. Schmidt	5439		
38236	7590	06/08/2004		EXAMINER		
DOMINIK		MIDT	PHU, SANH D			
P.O. BOX 20541 STANDFORD, CA 94309				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,			2682	<₽	
				DATE MAILED: 06/08/2004	, 0	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

In

		Anni	ication No.	Applicant(a)				
				Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary			02,411 —————————	SCHMIDT, DOMINIK J.	0/			
	Office Action Summary	Exar	niner	Art Unit	V			
			D Phu	2682				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this community or Reply	cation appears o	n the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNI nsions of time may be available under the provisions. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this comme a period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30 period for reply is specified above, the maximum stature to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months a ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In unication. o) days, a reply within th tutory period will apply will, by statute, cause th	no event, however, may a note that the statutory minimum of third and will expire SIX (6) MON the application to become AB	eply be timely filed  y (30) days will be considered timely.  ITHS from the mailing date of this communication  BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ın.			
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) file	d on <i>10 Mav 20</i> 0	04.					
· —		b)⊠ This action						
<i>'</i> =	Since this application is in condition	<i>,</i> —		ers, prosecution as to the merits is	s			
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restrict	e withdrawn from						
Applicat	ion Papers							
9)[	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
10)[	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted	or b)□ objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any object	ction to the drawin	g(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to		,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	d).			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority  2. Certified copies of the priority  3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation  See the attached detailed Office action	documents have documents have of the priority do nal Bureau (PC)	been received. been received in Acuments have been Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachmer	nt(s)							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)			Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🔲 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or Process)			s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

Art Unit: 2682

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

1. This Office Action is responsive to the Amendment filed on 5/10/04.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "said user" on line 16. This limitation is lack of antecedent basis.

Claims, depended on claim 11, are therefore also rejected.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary

Art Unit: 2682

skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 3

5. Claims 1-3, 6-13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz et al (2002/0059434), previously cited, in view of Wong (6,441,442), newly-cited.

As per claims 1 and 11, see figures 2-4, and sections [0012], [0038] to [0049], Karaoguz et al discloses a system (see figure 3) which comprises: a processor (66);

a multimode wireless device comprising:

an analog portion including:

a first radio core (68) which can be configured as a cellular radio core (see [0012]);

a radio sniffer (72, 68) for detecting and passing cellular radio signals being receiving by antenna (68);

a second radio core (70) which can be configured as a short-range wireless transceiver core (see [0012]);

a digital portion including:

Art Unit: 2682

a processor core (60, 62) handling a plurality of wireless

communication protocols; and a memory (84);

a program storage device (80, 82, 84) (see figure 4);

an input recognizer (82), embodied in said program storage device, to receive

an input from a user; and

a computer readable code embodied in said program storage device for

receiving the user input from said input recognizer (see [0042], [0047], [0048]).

Karaoguz et al does not disclose whether said analog portion and said

digital portion are integrated on the same substrate.

Wong teaches that radio frequency devices and digital devices can be all

on the same substrate using CMOS fabrication process (see ABSTRACT).

Therefore, for an application, it would have been obvious for a person

skilled in the art, when building Karaoguz et al invention, to integrate said

analog portion and said digital portion on the same substrate, as taught by

Wong, so that the fabrication/manufacture cost of the system would be reduced

(see Wong, col. 1, lines 47).

Page 4

Art Unit: 2682

As per claims 2 and 12, Karaoguz et al discloses that the system can conform with a Bluetooth protocol (see [0012]).

Page 5

As per claims 3 and 13, Karaoguz et al discloses that the system can conform with GSM protocol (see [0006], [0012]).

As per claims 6, 7, 16 and 17, Karaoguz et al disclose that said processor core includes plurals of processors (60, 62).

As per claims 8-10 and 18-20, Karaoguz et al discloses a router (64) coupled to the processor core, the cellular radio core, and the short-range transceiver core wherein the router comprises an engine that tracks destinations of information packets and sends them in parallel through a plurality of separate path ways on plural of channels (60, 62) (see figure 3).

6. Claims 4, 5, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karaoguz et al, in view of Wong, and further in view of Khullar et al (6,400,928), newly-cited.

As per claims 4, 5, 14 and 15, Karaoguz et al, in view of Wong, does not disclose that the system conforms with an Edge protocol or with a GPRS protocol.

Art Unit: 2682

Page 6

Khullar et al teaches that Edge protocols and/or GPRS protocols are used to optimize data communication and can be implemented on GSM systems (see col. 1, lines 15-24).

Therefore, for an application, it would have been obvious for a person skilled in the art, when building Karaoguz et al system in view of Wong, to implement the cellular radio core of the system conforming with Edge and/or GPRS protocols, as taught by Khullar et al, so that the data communications of the system would be optimized with high data rates and potentially higher in high quality radio environments.

### Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, filed on 5/13/04, with respect to claims 1–20 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims, with reasons set forth in the previous Office Action, has been withdrawn. However, the claims, after being further considered, are still unpatentable with reasons set forth above in this Office Action.

Art Unit: 2682

# Conclusion

Page 7

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications. from the examiner should be directed to Sanh D Phu whose telephone number is (703)305-8635. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-16:30.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Sanh D. Phu Examiner Art Unit 2682

Art Unit: 2682

SP

Page 8